L2/02-092

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2
Coded Character Sets
Secretariat: Japan (JISC)

DOC. TYPE	Disposition of Comments
TITLE	Dispostion of comments report on SC 2 N 3505, CD 2375.2: Information technology -- Procedure for registration of escape sequences and coded character sets
SOURCE	Mr. Michael Everson, Project Editor
PROJECT	
STATUS	In accordance with Resolution M11.11 adopted at the Eleventh Plenary Meeting of SC 2 held in Singapore, 2001-10-18/19, this document was prepared by Project Editor.
ACTION ID	FYI
DUE DATE	
DISTRIBUTION	P, O and L Members of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2 ; ISO/IEC JTC 1 Secretariat; ISO/IEC ITTF
ACCESS LEVEL	Def
ISSUE NO.	135

FILE	NAME	02n3591.pdf
	SIZE (KB)	
	PAGES	16

Title: ISO/IEC CD 2375: Editors' Disposition of Comment
Source: Michael Everson, Joan Aliprand, Edwin Hart
Project: JTC 1.02.04.00.00.00.04
Status: For information
Action: Review.
Date: 2001-11-30

Thirteen positive votes were received from Belgium. China, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, the Republic of Korea, the Netherlands, Norway, Romania, and Thailand. **Two** positive votes with comments were received from Poland and Sweden. **Three** negative votes with comments were received from Canada, Japan, and the U.S. The following disposition of comments is proposed:

Comments accompanying US ballot on ISO/IEC CD 2375.2

The US votes against adoption of ISO/IEC CD 2375.2 in document SC 2 N3505. If the US comments are accommodated, the US will revise its vote to approval.

Major Concerns
The US has the following major concerns about the second CD to ISO/IEC 2375. This document includes detailed comments and recommendations to help resolve these concerns.

1. Clarify Registration Procedures.
Clauses 13, 14 and 15 were modified as a result of the WG 3 ad hoc meeting to resolve issues with the first CD of ISO/IEC 2375. The US is concerned that the updates make the procedure unnecessarily complex and difficult to understand. The US, therefore, recommends that these clauses be reorganized. In Appendix B, the US proposes replacement text for these clauses.

The editor proposes to accept almost all of these changes.

2. Consider Bruce Paterson's Comments.
Bruce Paterson sent both technical and editorial comments to Michael Everson and Edwin Hart (see Appendix A). The US endorses the technical and editorial concerns raised by Bruce Paterson. However, the US requests a different resolution for a few of his concerns; in Appendix A, the US recommendations are enclosed in square brackets.

Accepted in principle.

3. Change the Emphasis for the Role of the RA-JAC.
In this revision of ISO/IEC 2375, the RA-JAC will assume a new role" of validating any optional mappings to ISO/IEC 10646. The US is concerned that the current text overemphasizes this role over the RA-JAC's traditional role as advisor to the Registration Authority and mediator.

Accepted in principle.

4. Reorganize the Subclauses of Clause 18.2.

Clause 18 was revised to respond to the issue of adding a mapping to an existing registration by adding clause 18.2. The first three subclauses (18.2.1, 18.2.2, 18.2.3) deal with the responsibilities of the Sponsoring Authority and therefore should be moved to clause 10. In addition, the US requests additional steps like those in clause 15 to complete the process. Request to Registration Authority When the RA starts adding mappings to ISO/IEC 10646, the RA may want to add a pointer to the Unicode Consortium website (http://www.unicode.org), where the Unicode Consortium has published many mapping tables.

Noted.

Detailed Comments
These comments are organized by the clause numbers of CD 2375.2 This set of comments is highly integrated so that a change in one clause depends on changes to other clauses as well.

1. Except for clause 6, change "subcommittee concerned with coded character sets" to "ISO/IEC supervisory body" to parallel the usage of the names from clauses 7 to 10 throughout the document.

Rejected. This does not accurately reflect the relationships.

2. *Introduction.* For the last sentence of the second paragraph, add."and the ISO/IEC 2375 register", after "2375".

Accepted.

3. *Clause 2.4,* remove the comma after the ")" in the last line.

Accepted.

4. *Clause 3.* The editor may consider adding the second part of ISO/IEC 10646 as a normative reference to the DIS.

Accepted.

5. *Clause 4.* In conjunction with Bruce Paterson's second technical comment about changing "final character" to "final byte" in clause 15.1, add a definition for the term

"byte". The following definition comes from ISO/IEC 8859:

"**byte:** A bit string that is operated upon as a unit."

Accepted.

6. *Clauses 4.6 and 4.7.* Change "ISO/IEC 6927" to "ISO/IEC 6937".

Accepted.

7. *Clause 5.1.* Replace clause 5.1 with clauses A.1 and A.2 revised as specified under the changes to clauses A.1 and A.2.

Accepted.

8. *Clause 7.2.2.* In the first bullet, change "12 and 13" to "12, 13, 14, and 15".

Accepted.

9. *Clause 7.2.5.* Add a comma after "example" in the fifth line.

Accepted.

10. *Clause 7.2.6.* Since ISO/IEC 8859 brings no requirements to the Registration Authority, the editor may wish to delete this standard from the list.

Accepted.

11. *Clause 10.2.2.4.* Getting endorsement of the developer of an application is not always possible or feasible. A simple example would be registration of a new G1 set for use on the Internet for e-mail. Where would one fine the developer of that application called e-mail for endorsement? Add a sentence to the end similar to the last sentence of clause 10.2.2.3:

> If the organization that developer of an application either no longer exists or cannot be identified, the requirement is waived.

In the second line, remove "to be a code".

Accepted.

12. *Clause 10.2.2.7.* Remove the clause. This is part of the procedure (clause 13.4) rather than a responsibility. The responsibilities are redundant to clause 10.2.2.6. Moreover, the SA is not required (the "shall") to make the updates because it may decide not to do the work that the RA requires for registration.

Accepted.

13. Clause 10.2.3.2. In the second line, add "or omission" after "error" and add "or a mapping" before the comma.

Accepted.

14. *Clause 11.1.* Add a new first subclause before clause 11.1:

> 11.1 Role
> The Registration Authority's Joint Advisory Committee (RA-JAC)
> – mediates appeals,
> – advises the Registration Authority on technical matters, and
> – verifies mappings to ISO/IEC 10646.

Accepted in principle (some wording to be changed).

15. *Clause 11.1.1.* Move the note to follow the rewritten and moved first sentence of clause 11.3.4. See comment on clause 11.3.4.

Accepted.

16. Clause 11.3.2. Remove the first sentence. When there is a difference of opinion between the Sponsoring Authority and the RA-JAC over the mapping table, the mapping in the registration needs to accommodate both viewpoints. Neither the SA nor the RA-JAC should have ultimate authority over the mapping. It is sufficiently clear from the second and third sentences of clause 11.3.2 that the mapping can and should include the views of both bodies when there is a difference of opinion. Therefore, the first sentence conflicts with the second and third sentences and it must be removed.

In addition, replace the last sentence to indicate that the RA may add information to the mapping table over the objections of the Sponsoring Authority. Here is suggested text:

> If the Sponsoring Authority and the RA-JAC cannot agree on changes to the mapping provided by the Sponsoring Authority, the RA may add supplementary information from the RA-JAC to the mapping even if the Sponsoring Authority objects.

Accepted.

17. *Clause 11.3.3.* Change the emphasis by replacing the clause with the following:

> At the request of the Sponsoring Authority, the RA-JAC may provide assistance in preparing a mapping to ISO/IEC 10646. However, the RA-JAC shall not be required to create the mapping. In addition, if a registration application does not include a mapping, the RA-JAC shall not create the mapping.

Accepted.

18. *Clauses 11.3.4 and 11.3.5.* We agree with Bruce Paterson about clauses 11.3.4 and 11.3.5 being part of the registration procedure. However, we disagree with moving them to clause 14 because, for the most part, they duplicate subclauses of clause 13: clause 11.3.4 duplicates clause 13.5 and clause 11.3.5 duplicates clause 13.9.3. Also, note that the first sentence of clause 11.3.4 contains an important RA-JAC responsibility. Therefore, add a new clause before clause 11.3.2 with the following text:

For those applications which include a mapping to ISO/IEC 10646, the RA-JAC reviews and validates the mapping. See [CD-2] clause13.5 [editor to verify cross reference].

Accepted.

19. *Clauses 11.3.6 and 11.3.7.* Move these clauses after clause 11.3.1 to shift the emphasis of the RA-JAC back to the responsibility of mediator of appeals as appeared in earlier editions of ISO 2375.

Accepted.

20. *Clause 12.1.3.* Change "and" to a comma, and insert "and 10.2.2.5" before the period to cover the insertion of a new clause to clause 10.2.2 and the need for the Owner of Origin to verify redrawing of the code table and/or list of character names.

Accepted.

21. Clause 13.4. Issue of redrawing of the coded character set. Clause 13.4 introduced a requirement for the Owner to review and certify a redrawing if this is requested by the RA to improve legibility. This same concern applies when the SA includes a redrawn coded character set as part of a new registration application. Since this concern applies in both instances, the requirement for Owner review in the second sentence in clause 13.4 should be moved to clause 10. Delete the second sentence of clause 13.4 and add the following clause between clauses 10.2.2.4 and 10.2.2.5:

> If the coded character set to be included in the registration is not the coded character set as originally published but a redrawing for the purpose of the registration, then the Owner of Origin shall certify that the character shapes and character names in the revision are accurate with respect to the coded character set as it was originally published. If the Owner of Origin no longer exists or cannot be identified, then the Sponsoring Authority shall include both the redrawing and the document used as the source for the redrawing in the application.

Modify the last sentence and move it as a new clause between clauses 11.2.2.4 and 11.2.2.5. This action applies before submitting the application or after the RA requests an update; so it is better to place it in one location under the responsibilities of the SA. Suggested text is:

> If the Sponsoring Authority changes the description of the coded character set (for example, by redrawing the code table and/or list of character names), the Sponsoring Authority shall obtain the endorsement of the Owner of Origin if the Owner of Origin can be identified and still exists.

Add a new sentence to clause 13.4:

> If the Registration Authority requires that the code table and/or list of character names be redrawn, then clause 11.2.2.5 applies. [clause 11.2.2.5 is the new clause created by rewriting and moving the last sentence of 13.4]

Accepted.

22. *Clause 16.5.1.* Change "cee" to "see".

Accepted.

23. *Clause 18.2.1.* Replace "when required" with "as needed" and move this clause to between clauses 10.2.3.2 and 10.2.3.3 so that it becomes the new clause 10.2.3.3.

Accepted.

24. *Clause 18.2.2.* Add the following sentence to the end: "The Registration Authority shall process the proposed mapping as if it had been included in the original application."

Accepted.

25. *Clause 18.2.3.* Delete this clause because the updates to clause 10.2.3.2 cover this responsibility.

Accepted.

26. *Clause 18.2.4.* For the last sentence, replace "request" through the end of the sentence with the following text:
> state whether
> – a mapping table is being added
> – an existing mapping table is being revised

Accepted.

27. *Clause 18.2.5.* To the end of the first sentence, add "(clause 14)" because the revised clause 14 describes this procedure. Remove the second sentence.

Accepted.

28. *Clause 18.2.6.* Replace the text with:
> The Registration Authority shall publish an approved mapping in accordance with clause 15.2.

Accepted.

29. *Clause 18.2.7.* Add a new clause
> The Registration Authority shall notify the Sponsoring Authority of publication of the additional or revised mapping.

Accepted.

30. *Clause 18.2.8.* Add a new clause
> The Registration Authority shall announce publication of the additional or revised mapping to interested parties (see clause 7.2.4).

Accepted.

31. *Clause 19.3.2.* Add "by the Sponsoring Authority" to the end of the last sentence and change "13.7" to "13.8".

Accepted.

32. *Clause A.* Change the title to "Details of registrations".

3

Accepted.

33. *Clauses A.1 and A.2.* In clause A.1, replace "two" with "three", insert "mapping tables associated with registrations," before "and". Replace clause 5.1 with revised clause A.1 and clause A.2.

Accepted.

34. *Clause A.3.* It is unclear what parts are mandatory and which are optional. See the comment for clause A.3.2. Change clause A.3 to:

> Each registration shall include the cover page and, except for ISO and ISO/IEC coded character set standards, a description of the coded character set. The registration may also include a mapping to ISO/IEC 10646 as an option.

Accepted in principle.

35. *Clause A.3.1.1.* In the last bullet, replace "and" with "If so, then the identify of that coded character set shall be given (see clause 18.1.3).".

Accepted, but with the word "identity".

36. *Clause A.3.1.1.* In the fourth bullet from the end of this section, insert "ISO/IEC 2022 standard" before "return", and enclose "escape sequence ESC 2/5 4/0" in parenthesis.

Accepted.

37. *Clause A.3.1.1.* In the bullet text, "the description will state if any of the following conditions apply", change "will" to "shall".

Accepted.

38. *Clause A.3.1.2.* In the fourth bullet, replace "changed" to "revised".

Accepted.

39. *Clause A.3.2.1.1.* A multi-octet coded character set should be shown as a set of 16 by 16 code tables as specified in the first CD. ISO/IEC 10646 uses 16 by 16 code tables and sets the standard for multi-octet coded character sets. The 24 by 24 code table in the second CD is too difficult to read. Change "24 rows by 24 columns" to "16 rows by 16 columns". This change affects at least clauses A.3.2.1.1, and D.4.

Rejected. 24 x 24 tables are currently registered, and removing the specification here could compromise existing registrations. A 16 x 16 table will be added.

40. *Clause A.3.2.* Change the title to only "Coded character set".

Accepted.

41. Clause *A.3.2.2.2.* In the sixth line, change "registrations" to "a registration".

Accepted.

42. *Clause A.4.* Add new clauses after A.4.1 to identify the coded character set of the registration and the creation date. Even if the mapping information is included as part of the registration, the mapping needs to include the identity of the coded character set of the registration. Suggested text is:

> The mapping shall identify the coded character set mapped to ISO/IEC 10646, e.g., by name and registration number.
> The mapping should include the date of creation.

Accepted.

43. *Clause A.4.6.* Change the second bullet to "the corresponding ISO/IEC 10646 code position or combining sequence."

Accepted.

44. *Clause A.4.7.* Remove the text "to retain round trip integrity" to resolve Bruce Paterson's comment. Before the last sentence, add a new sentence, "Since use of private use areas requires an agreement between the sender and receiver about the meaning of the code positions in the private use area, use of private use areas is discouraged." In the last sentence, add "Consequently," at the beginning and replace "a private use area" with "a code position from the private use area or planes".

Accepted.

45. *Clause A.4.9.* Remove the second sentence of the first bullet. This sentence reads: "Any alternate mapping should be on a separate line." This sentence causes a conflict with clause A.4.4. See the comments on clause A.4.10 for the place to describe alternate mappings in the mapping information.

Accepted.

46. *Clause A.4.9.* In second bullet, change "Each record" to "Each line of text" and remove "U+0009" since the control character is from ISO/IEC 6429 rather than ISO/IEC 10646.

Accepted.

47. *Clause A.4.10.* Clarify to indicate that supplementary information, such as alternate mappings, belongs after the mapping records provided by the Sponsoring Authority. (See comment on clause A.4.9.) Replace the sentence with:

> After the mapping records, the mapping may include supplementary information for clarification, e.g., when a special situation may warrant an alternate mapping for a character.

4

Accepted.

48. *Clause A4.11.* Move after clause A.4.12 to show a sequence of action and relative position of the information (at the end of the mapping).

Accepted.

49. *Clause A.4.12.* Clause A.4 is about the content of the mapping rather than the procedure to product that content. Revise the text to specify the identification and location rather than the procedure for including RA-JAC information. Delete the first sentence, then replace the second sentence by:
> Alternate mapping and additional information supplied by the RA-JAC (See [new] clause 14.5) shall be located after the mapping information provided by the Sponsoring Authority and shall be identified under the heading, "Additional information provided by the ISO/IEC 2375 Registration Authority".

Accepted.

50. *Clause A.5.* Move after clause 5.2 and the moved clause A.7. Indices are an integral part of the International Register now specified in clause 5. Annex A now describes only the details of registrations.

Accepted.

51. *Clause A.7.* Remove the title clause A.7. In the third line of the second paragraph of clause A.7.2, add a comma after "ISO/IEC", remove "or", and add "or ITU" before "(for". Move clause A.7.1 and A.7.2 after clause 5.2. See comment for clause A.5.

Accepted.

52. *Clause B.1.1.* Delete "complete coding system," because CD-2 replace this term with "coding systems not conformant with ISO/IEC 2022" to better describe the concept.

Accepted.

53. *Clauses D.1 and D.2.* Reorganize clauses D.1 and D.2 into one clause with the title, 7-bit graphic character sets:
> D.1 7-bit graphic character sets
> D.1.1 94-character graphic character sets
> D.1.2 96-character graphic character sets

Remove the second sentence under clause D.2 about shading not applying to standards not in conformance to ISO/IEC 2022. This would allow registering of 7-bit coded character with graphic characters in the first two columns.

Accepted.

54. *Clause D.4.* See the comments on clause A.3.2.1.1. Change the code table for multi-octet coded character sets to 16 by 16.

Rejected as per comments on clause A.3.2.1.1.

If the editor rejects this comment

Well, it is necessary to do so.

the rows and columns in the 24 by 24 table are incorrectly labelled because the bit patterns range from 33 to 56 decimal or 21 to 38 hexadecimal rather than from the 1 to 24 decimal and 00 to 17 hexadecimal as shown in the present table.

Accepted in principle. This needs checking against existing registrations.

Moreover, it appears that bit b1 (b1) of the first column should be "1" instead of "0".

Accepted in principle. The correct usage will be verified.

Appendix A. Comments from Bruce Paterson

From: B Paterson
To: Michael Everson; Edwin F Hart
Cc: Mike Ksar
Subject: Comments on ISO/IEC CD 2375.2

Michael and Ed,

I have just reviewed CD 2375.2, edited by both of you plus Joan Aliprand according to its cover page. I have a few comments, including one significant technical comment, but I am unable to submit them via the UK National Body since it is no longer a member of JTC1/SC2. I would be glad if you would consider them, and perhaps include them with one of your own NB's comments if you agree they need to be taken into consideration.

In general, I am quite impressed with the care that has evidently gone into tightening up the provisions in this CD, and defining the various entities and their responsibilities, the application and the procedures, in more detail than before. I hope that the IT community will actually find it useful after all this effort.

Regards - Bruce.

A. Technical Comments

1. In Annex A.3.1.1, 1st and 2nd sub-sub-bullets, the distinction shown between the two types of 94-character graphic set is false. There is only one type of 94-character graphic set. The "one intermediate byte" and "second intermediate byte" that are mentioned are features of the assigned escape sequences, not of the sets themselves.

(The second intermediate byte supplements the final byte when all the available final byte values have been used up, as specified in ISO/IEC 2022 clauses 13.2.2 and 14.1.)

Accepted.

2. In 15.1, following on from the above comment, The RA must, when appropriate, assign a 2nd intermediate

byte as well as a final byte. [Accommodated in the revised procedures in Appendix B.]

Which were accepted.

Note also that the correct term from ISO/IEC 2022 is "final byte", and not "final character" (3 instances in 15.1).

Accepted.

B. Editorial Comments
1. Contents list on page ii: In the title of clause 14 ISO/IEC has been mis-spelled as 1SO/1EC.

Accepted.

2. Mis-use of the word "shall". The word "shall" should be confined to stating requirements of this standard, within its stated scope. The following are inappropriate places for its use -

- Clause 1.2 line 6. Replace "shall" by "are recommended to", as this standard cannot mandate the "organizations" that are the subject of the sentence. [The US recommends resolution by replacing "shall" with "need to".]

U.S. comment accepted.

- Clause 2.3 line 2. Replace "shall serve" by "serves", as it is a statement of fact, not a requirement on any body or thing.

Accepted.

- Clause 2.4 line 4. Replace "shall identify" by "identifies", as it is a statement of fact, and the various requirements are covered elsewhere (Annex A).

Accepted.

3. 11.3.4 & 11.3.5. These sub-clauses are details of the registration procedures, and thus belong better in clause 14 than here. [See US comment on these two clauses.]

The U.S. comment was accepted.

4. Annex A.3.1.2, 3rd bullet. Alter "sequence" to "sequence(s)", since for registration of a graphic character set there are 3 or 4 sequences, for G0, G1, G2, G3 code elements respectively. Of course the sequences all have the same final (and 2nd intermediate) byte, and that is the unique component of the sequence(s) in each registration.

Accepted.

5. A.3.2.2.2 line 6. Alter "registrations" to "a registration", to match the title of A.3.

Accepted.

6. A.4.1 The sentence is confusing. Rearrange as:
"A mapping of the characters in the coded character set to ISO/IEC 10646 equivalents may be included in the registration as an option. If such a mapping is included then the following requirements apply." [US recommends adding a comma before "then" of the last sentence.]
The reason is that otherwise the "shalls" in A.4.2ff seem to conflict with the "shall" in A.4.1.

Accepted.

7. A.4.7 line 6. The term "round trip integrity" should be defined or omitted. [The US recommends omitting the term.]

U.S. recommendation accepted.

8. A.4.9 line 1. Delete "to", it's a typo.

Accepted.

Appendix B. Revised Registration Procedure (Clauses 13, 14, 15)

The editor accepts these comments in toto.

The proposed text is shown in the Times font. Explanatory comments are in an indented smaller Times font.

13 Registration procedure

13.1 The Sponsoring Authority shall prepare an application for registration according to clause 12.
 No change to this clause

13.2 The Sponsoring Authority shall submit an application for registration of a coded character set to the Registration Authority.
 No change to this clause

13.3 The Registration Authority shall examine each application received. It shall ascertain that
– The proposed coded character set is not identical to a coded character set already registered. See Annex B.2.
– The application for registration of a sing" additional control function to be represented by the F s escape sequence (see ISO/IEC 2022) is from the subcommittee concerned with coded character sets. See Annex C.
If the application fails to meet either of these requirements, the application shall be rejected. (See Clause 13.11.)
 Clause 13.3 in CD2 includes two types of requirements. If either the 2 nd or the last requirement is not met, the application is rejected outright. If any of the other requirements are not met, the application may be amended and resubmitted. Clause 13.3 has therefore been split into two clauses.

13.4 The Registration Authority shall also ascertain that
– The application is formally in accordance with this

International Standard and, where applicable, with ISO/IEC 2022, ISO/IEC 646 and ISO/IEC 4873.

– The application for registration is legible and meets the presentation practice of the Registration Authority. See clause 7.2.5.
– The application includes the elements required from the Sponsoring Authority for the cover page. See clause 12.1.1.
– The application for registration includes the required description of the coded character set. See clause 12.1.2.
– The application for registration includes any required copyright permissions and endorsements. See clause 12.1.3.

If the application for registration fails to meet any of these requirements, the Registration Authority shall inform the Sponsoring Authority of the changes needed to meet the requirement(s). If the Registration Authority requires that the code table and/or list of character names be redrawn, then [new] clause 10.2.2.5 applies.

> Part of Clause 13.3 (edited) plus 1st sentence of Clause 13.4 (modified). These are the requirements which may be met with a modified application. This corrects the first bullet that omitted coded character sets not in conformance with ISO/IEC 2022 by moving "where applicable". ISO/IEC 2375 is for registering coded character sets that are not in conformance with ISO/IEC 2022 ("complete character sets" in the first CD) in addition to those that are in conformance with ISO/IEC 2022. The remainder of Clause 13.4 of CD2 (dealing with verification by the Owner of Origin) has been moved to Clause 10.2.2 because it may apply to an initial application as well.

13.5 When requested by the RA, the RA-JAC may provide an opinion on whether an application for registration meets the requirements of Clauses 13.3 and 13.4.

> New. The RA-JAC had this duty in the past.

13.6 If the registration includes a mapping, the procedures in Clause 14 apply.

> Clauses 13.5 through 13.7 of CD2 moved to Clause 14 (which covers review of the mapping).

13.7 When an application for registration and its accompanying mapping (if included) have passed the Registration Authority review and the RA-JAC review, the Registration Authority shall circulate the application and the mapping to the members of the subcommittee concerned with coded character sets for a three-month information and comment period. This clause does not apply If the application is for a coded character set standard owned by the subcommittee concerned with coded character sets.

> Corresponds to Clause 13.8 in CD2. In the 2nd sentence, "approved" has been changed to "owned" to avoid confusion with approval of the registration by the RA and to indicate that SC2 is the Owner of Origin of coded character sets which qualify for this waiver.

13.8 The Registration Authority shall consider all comments received, and then approve or reject the application for registration.

> Clause 13.9 of CD2, modified. (Note that no reference to Clause 13.11 is needed here because this is a drop-through situation.)

13.9 The Registration Authority may request the RA-JAC to provide expert technical advice on the comments.

> New. Sanctions role of RA-JAC to assist RA with technical issues.

13.10 The Registration Authority shall process approved applications in accordance with Clause 15. The Registration Authority may incorporate comments resulting from the review specified in Clause 13.7 into the final registration.

> Clause 13.10 of CD2 plus part of Clause 13.9 (edited).

13.11 When an application for registration is rejected, the Registration Authority shall inform the Sponsoring Authority and provide the reason for the rejection.

> New. Rejection must be communicated to the Sponsoring Authority if there is to be an appeal (Clause 16.2)

14 Evaluation of mapping to ISO/IEC 10646

> Spelling of title corrected (editorial comment by Bruce Paterson)

14.1 The Registration Authority shall circulate any registration application with a mapping to ISO/IEC 10646 to the members of the RA-JAC for a technical review of not more than two months. This clause does not apply if the mapping has been created and reviewed by the subcommittee concerned with coded character sets.

> Clause 13.5 of CD2, modified. See also comments about Clause 13.7 above. Wording of the final sentence addresses the US requirement that the mapping be subject to review by qualified experts, in this case, SC 2 or its WGs.

14.2 The RA-JAC shall evaluate any mapping included in an application for technical suitability according to Annex A.4.

> Clause 14.1 of CD2, edited.

14.3 The RA-JAC shall report the results of its evaluation to the Registration Authority and shall describe any technical concerns with the proposed mapping.

> Clause 14.2 of CD2, unchanged.

14.4 The Registration Authority shall inform the Sponsoring Authority of any changes to the mapping recommended by the RA-JAC.

> Clause 13.6 of CD2, modified. In particular, the "required" technical changes have been changed to "recommendations", because the RA-JAC cannot compel the Sponsoring Authority to make the changes.

14.5 If the Sponsoring Authority disagrees with the recommendations of the RA-JAC, then the Registration Authority shall include not only the mapping from the Sponsoring Authority but also information from the RA-JAC in the registration. The information from the RA-JAC may include an alternative mapping, if appropriate. The Registration Authority shall notify the Sponsoring

Authority about the information added to the mapping.
Clause 13.7 of CD2, edited.

14.6 The Registration Authority shall circulate the mapping (amended according to Clause 14.5 if necessary) to the members of the subcommittee concerned with coded character sets for review in accordance with Clause 13.7.
New. Specifies what is done with the mapping after review by the RA-JAC.

14.7 The RA-JAC, in consultation with the Sponsoring Authority, may assist the Registration Authority to resolve comments on the mapping.
i.e., Clause 13.9 of CD2, modified. Clauses 13.9.1 through 13.9.3 of CD2 are eliminated.

15 Processing of an approved application

15.1 The Registration Authority shall assign the escape sequence.
– Final bytes shall be allocated by the Registration Authority in ascending order. This allocation shall only be made immediately prior to publication of the registration, that is, after completion of all procedural steps.
– The Registration Authority shall, when appropriate, assign a second intermediate byte in addition to the final byte, as specified in ISO/IEC 2022.
– No final byte(s) shall be reserved for future registration applications.
– A final byte once allocated to a registered character or coded character set shall never be re- allocated for another registration.
Change of "character" to "byte" recommended by Bruce Paterson (technical comment). Bullet on second intermediate byte added to accommodate technical comment by Bruce Paterson.

15.2 When the mapping to ISO/IEC 10646 in a registration is approved, the Registration Authority shall record the date of approval and shall then make the mapping (including any additional information as specified in clauses 14.5 and 14.7) available in machine-readable form. See Annex A.4 for details about the format for the mapping.
Clause 15.2 of CD2, modified to add task of recording the date of approval of the mapping.

15.3 The Registration Authority shall publish the approved registration in the ISO/IEC 2375 register.
Clause 15.3 of CD2, unchanged.

15.4 The Registration Authority shall notify the Sponsoring Authority of the publication of the registration.
Clause 15.4 of CD2, unchanged.

15.5 The Registration Authority shall announce publication of the registration (and mapping if present) to interested parties (see clause 7.2.4).
Clause 15.5 (edited) of CD2.
[END OF PROCEDURE]

Attachment 1 - Canada
Comments on SC2 N3505 - CD 2375.2 - Procedure for registration of escape sequences and coded character sets

1. Introduction, page iv, end paragraph, last sentence:
Change to read:
Instead, it depends on this standard, ISO/IEC 2375, and the associated International Registry, to assign the meanings.

Accepted.

2. Clause 3 - Normative References
a. Add reference to ISO/IEC 10646-2: 2001 (By the time the revision of this standard progresses to FDIS, FDIS 10646-2 is expected to have been approved as an IS).

Accepted.

b. Reference to ISO Directives - Part 1, dated 1995, should be replaced with reference to the latest JTC1 Directives (dated 1999-09-23 at the ITTF's web site). There is specific mention of ISO 2375 and the Registration Authority for it, in the JTC1 Directives. The 1995 version of ISO Directives Part 1 is under revision.)

Accepted in principle. The most current approved version will be used. This will be corrected by ITTF in any case.

3. Terminology and Definitions alignment with JTC1 Directives. The CD document should be checked for terminology alignment with Annex E of JTC1 Directives dated 1999.) For example - the term APPLICANT are used to refer to SPONSORING AUTHORITY used in ISO 2375; TECHNICAL GROUP refers to the ISO/IEC SUPERVISORY BODY etc. ISO 2375 predates JTC1 directives, and this is the opportunity to align CD2375.2 with the JTC1 procedure document. Also, the Registration coversheets etc. have to be aligned with Annex E of JTC1 Directives.

Rejected. JTC1 in its directives is using generic terminology in this case. (Annex E provides "guidance".) In ISO/IEC 2375, we are using a specific terminology which is clear and helpful to the user of the standard; for instance, the term "Sponsoring Authority" is more informative than "Applicant".

4. Clauses 4.6 and 4.7. References to ISO/IEC 6927 in clauses 4.6 and 4.7 should be corrected to ISO/IEC 6937.

Accepted.

A new Annex - Bibliography (for example) should be created to list such non-normative references.

Rejected. Japan asked for it to be placed in the normative references, where it appears it will do no harm. If ITTF disapproves of this they will tell us.

5. Clause 7.2.6, page 3
a. Current 2375 standard, calls for a TECHNICAL OFFI-CER of RA to participate in Coding Standards committee. Clause 7.2.6 calls for "representative of RA". Change it to "technical representative".

Accepted.

b. Delete ISO/IEC 8859 from the list of standards in this clause. It is not in the same catergory as the others as far as Registration Authority's role is concerned.

Accepted.

6. Clause 9 - Copyright Owner
Copyright Owner -- should be moved to Terms and Definitions -- instead of being a separate clause.

Rejected. Just because the clause is short does not mean it is not structurally identical to clauses 8 and 10.

7. Clause 10.2.1, second dashed item
Should "Actions relating to .." be reworded to "Actions related to .." ?

Accepted.

8. Clause 10.2.2.1
Change "A Sponsoring Authority shall receive proposals .." to "A Sponsoring Authority receives proposals .. ".

Accepted.

Check use of the word "shall" in all the clauses for its appropriate use. General rule is that "Shall" is to be used when there is some sort of "conformance" is expected.

Accepted.

JTC1 procedures document calls the party submitting a registration application to the RA an APPLICANT. SC2 has to decide if it wants to keep the old 2375 terminology or align with latest JTC1 terminology associated with Registration Authority, Registrations etc. Canada recommends an alignment with latest JTC1 Procedures document. This would mean some changes to the COVER PAGES used for new submissions, in the current ISO-IR, and terminology in the RA's practices document.

Noted.

9. Clause 10.1.1
Change "A Sponsoring Authority can submit applications ..." to "A Sponsoring Authority submits applications .." or "A Sponsoring Authority is the submitter of applications .."

Accepted.

A separate clause should be added to address what hap-pens when a Sponsoring Authority disppears, especially TCs and SCs of ISO and IEC are disbanded for lack of projects from time to time or due to reorganizations etc. What should the RA do when original submitter is not to be found when, for example, mapping to 10646 is desirable to be added to an existing registration, or to respond to clause 10.2.2.7 etc.

Accepted in principle. Clause 10.2.2.5 will be reworded.

10. Clause 11.1.1
The representative of the RA in the RA-JAC should be a "technical representative". Similarly the national body representatives must be "technical experts" from the national bodies.

Accepted.

11. Responsibilities of RA-JAC
The first important role of RA-Joint ADVISORY Committee's is its ADVISORY role. This means assisting in the review of submissions towards technical correct-ness and completeness and provide feedback to the Sponsor. If the SA did not submit a mapping table to 10646, for example, the RA-JAC may suggest to SA an appropriate mapping table towards improving the utility of the registration, if it considers that such a mapping table would be useful to the users of the registration. The second important role is to be the body responsible for dealing with APPEALS. The way the clauses are written, these are not coming out clearly. It "reads" as if the RA-JAC is pre-occupied with mapping to 10646 than any-thing else.

Accepted.

12 Clause 11.3.2
Ultimate responsibility of the contents of a Registration rests with the SPONSORING AUTHORITY, including the contents of any mapping tables to 10646. If RA-JAG and Sponsoring Authority cannot come to an agreement on the final content of such a mapping table, then RA may add the RA-JAC's supplementary information or alternatives with some explanation, to the registration.

Rejected. See resolution to Japanese comment J-2.

13 Clause 13.5
The RA should circulate the application to the RA-JAG even if it does not have a mapping to 10646. delete the words ..with a mapping to 10646 ..

Accepted.

The last sentence raises the question -- if the application is from SC2, for example, the registration does NOT need to have a mapping to 10646? Or, it is expected to have one?

It is optional.

14 Clause 13.7
Reword ..
> If the Sponsoring Authority disagrees with RA-JAC concerns about the mapping ..

to ..

> If any disagreement between the Sponsoring Authority and RA-JAC concerning the mapping to ..cannot be resolved, then the RA shall keep the mapping from SA. Additionally, on the recommendation of the RA-JAC, the RA may add alternative mappings and supplementary information to the...

This change would also make it more in tune with clause 11.3.2.

Rejected. See resolution to Japanese comment J-2.

15. Clauses 13.9.2, 13.9.3
These clauses and possibly others are addressing the case where there could be delays in coming to an agreed upon mapping table to 10646, and there is no disagreement on any other parts of the Registration Application. In such as case the RA should go ahead and publish the agreed upon content of the registration and when the mapping tables are consolidated add it to the published registration. This aspect should be relegated to Clause 15, thereby simplifying what is in clause 13.

Accepted. Changes to clause 13.7 resolves this also.

16. Clause 14
This clause should be deleted. The review of the mapping table should not be singled out from the review of the application itself. If any mapping table is submitted with the original application, clauses in 13 should address its review automatically. If one is not submitted, as indicated earlier, the RA-JAC can suggest one, where needed, during the review. Different clauses in 13 already address the mapping table review.

Accepted via reorganization following U.S. comments.

17. Clause 15.2
There is a mention of availability in machine readable form in the middle of the clause. The aspect of RA making the mapping table available in a machine readable form should be removed from here and made a separate clause all by itself. For example: When a registration includes one or more mapping tables to 10646, the mapping table(s) shall be made in available in a machine readable form (format to be specified in the Practice of RA document, for example see Annex ..).

Accepted. See new clause 15.2.

18. Clause 17.1, Second Sentence.
This sentence does not make any sense. If the correction is to UPDATE the REFERENCE only, then it may be doable. If the correction is to the external referenced document itself, this sentence needs some thought. When an external document exists and is referenced by a registra-tion, even the Sponsoring Authority,or even the owner of origin, may not be able to do anything about that external document.

Accepted. The sentence will be deleted.

Same problem with Clause 17.2 - second sentence. Not clear as to what is meant here.

Accepted. The sentence will be deleted.

19. Clause 18.1.2
.... waiver of clause 18.1 to .. should be ... waiver of clause 18.1.1 ... ??

Accepted.

20. Clause A.3
Reword as follows:
> Each registration shall comprise the following parts:
>   - Cover page
>   - Description of the coded character or character set
> Additionally, a registration may have
>   - Mapping to ISO/IEC 10646

Rejected. This is not correct if a registration is for an ISO or ISO/IEC coded character set.

21. A.2 Format of the IR
> ... electronic format ..,

should be reworded:
> ... electronic format on the internet, and optionally on other electronic media. It may also be made available on paper. The mapping tables to 10646 for the registrations shall be made available in a machine readable format ...

Accepted.

22. A.3 Cover Page
Please ensure alignment with the JTC1 procedure's Annex E regarding cover page for registrations.

The term "cover page" does not appear in annex E of the JTC1 procedures.

23. Clause A3.1.1
Dashed item beginning with "the coded character set is intentionally a subset ..
> " ... the standard or standards shall be included either in the short ..

should be changed to
> ... reference(s) to the standard(s) shall be included either in the short ..

Accepted.

Comments accompanying Japanese ballot on ISO/IEC CD 2375.2

Japan disapproves the 2nd CD2375 (SC2 N3505) with the following comments. This CD has so many errors and/or questionable items that the changes based on them will affect all over the CD's text. Therefore, Japan requests the project editor to accept these Japanese comments, rewrite the text and submit it as the 3rd CD.

Accepted in principle. However, the document has passed its CD ballot, so it will not be sent out as a 3rd CD, but rather as a DIS or FCD.

MAJOR TECHNICAL COMMENTS:
J-1. Clause 11.3, 13.5 and 13.8, Responsibility of the RA-JAC
Clause 11.3 and its sub-clauses say that the activity of the RA-JAC is only the matter of mapping of ISO/IEC 10646. On the other hand, clause 13.5 and 13.8 say that the RA-JAC does technical reviews of applications, not only the matter of mapping. There is some contradiction. Japan believes that the RA-JAC should be responsible to all technical matters of applications for registration, not only the matter of mapping.

Accepted. See new clause 11.1.

J-2. Clause 13.7, Alternative Mappings
Japan strongly opposes this clause with the following two reasons:
-- The idea of "Alternative Mapping" described here is beyond the resolution No.2 of SC2 N3479.
-- Japan believes that any mapping suggested by the RA-JAC but not agreed by the SA shall not be registered, even as "Alternative Mapping". In other words, an entire registration shall be what is totally agreed by its SA.

Accepted in principle. Clause 13.7 will be rewritten.

J-3. Addition of Flow Charts
Add flow charts, which illustrate the procedures on this standard. The addition of such flow charts was agreed at the latest WG3 meeting in Athens.

Accepted.

OTHER COMMENTS:
J-4. Clause 1.1
Rewrite this clause. RATIONALE: This CD specifies not only RA's procedures but also such as RA-JAC and SA.

Accepted.

J-5. Clause 1.2
Change "ISO" for "ISO and/or IEC".

Accepted.

J-6. Clause 3

Add ISO/IEC 6937 as a normative reference. RATIONALE: It is referred in clause 4.6 and 4.7. (6927?)

Accepted.

J-7. Clause 3
Check if 1995 is the latest date of ISO Directives.

Accepted.

J-8. Clause 4.6 and 4.7
Change "ISO/IEC 6927" for "ISO/IEC 6937".

Accepted.

J-9. Clause 5.1
Change "A registration consists of a cover page, and a" for "A registration shall consist a cover page and a".

Rejected. This cannot be accepted because it is possible for a registration to be only be a cover sheet for ISO or ISO/IEC standards. See clause 12.1.1.

J-10. Clause 5.2
Remove this clause. RATIONALE: Clause 7.2.3 covers the same requirement.

Accepted.

J-11. Clause 7.2.5
Change the parenthesized phrase "(for example fonts for the code table, terminology, identification of unused position, etc.)" for "(for example printed code tables, terminology, identification of unused position, etc)". RATIONALE: Collection or maintenance of fonts is beyond the responsibility of the RA.

Rejected. The ECMA rules specified the fonts to be used in making the application. This is informative and does not force any behaviour on the RA.

J-12. Clause 7.2.6
Remove the phrase "involved with the work on ISO/IEC 646, ISO/IEC 2022, ISO/IEC 4873, ISO/IEC 8859, ISO/IEC 10646 and on other coding standards where required." RATIONALE: Japan supposes that such an enumeration of names of these standards is not necessary. But if it is really necessary, Japan requests to add "ISO/IEC 6429" into this enumeration, because registrations of control functions are one of major potions of this CD's scope.

6429 will be added. 8859 will be deleted per other comments.

J-13. Clause 10.1.1
Change the first sentence for "A Sponsoring Authority is an organization that submits applications concerning the meanings of escape sequences to the Registration Authority." RATIONALE: The purpose of this clause is

to define a SA. Japan feels that the word "can" is not suitable for this sentence for the definition.

Accepted.

J-14. Clause 10.2.2.5
Add following phrase into the last sentence: "with agreement with the Owner of Origin."

Rejected. If they don't exist one cannot get them to agree.

J-15. Clause 11.1.1
Delete the NOTE. RATIONALE: The word "consult" reminds the possibility that the RA-JAC would be controlled by some other organizations. Even though each member of the RA-JAC may consult other experts, this NOTE says too much thing not necessary to note.

Accepted.

J-16. Clause 11.3.2
Insert a new sentence between the second and the third sentences as follows:
> Furthermore, the RA-JAC shall not add any other mappings to an application without the permission of the Sponsoring Authority.

Accepted in principle. This is handled by the rewritten clause 13.2

J-17. Clause 12.1.1
There is a missing text that is regarding the non-ISO or non-ISO/IEC coded character sets. There is a necessity of other information as well as cover sheet for non-ISO or non-ISO/IEC coded character sets.

Rejected. Covered in clauses 12.1.2 and B.1.

J-18. Clause 12.1.4
Rewrite whole of this clause as follows:
> 12.1.4 Registration application may optionally include mappings to ISO/IEC 10646 (see annex A.4).

RATIONALE: Clause 12.1 and its sub-clauses should only describe the administrative requirements for registration applications.

Accepted in principle.

ADDITIONAL QUESTION: If a registration application from the SA includes more than one mapping to ISO/IEC 10646, is it acceptable?

This is a matter for the JAC to decide if it ever happens. The editor personally thinks it is unlikely that the JAC would permit such a thing.

J-19. Clause 13.5
Remove "with a mapping to ISO/IEC 10646". RATIONALE: This sentence is not regarding the case that an application does not include a mapping. Moreover, a

mapping itself is a content of an application if provided.

Accepted.

J-20. Clause 13.9.2
Rewrite the first words "This review" much more clearly. They may be the procedure of clause 13.9.1?

The clause has been rewritten per US comments.

J-21. Clause 13.9.3
Rewrite the first words "After the review period" much more clearly.

The clause has been rewritten per US comments.

J-22. Clause 16.3
Remove a "that" from the third dash.

Accepted.

J-23. Clause 18.1.2
Remove "of clause 18.1" from the first sentence. It does not make sense.

Rejected. Changed to "of clause 18.1.1" which does make sense.

J-24. Clause 18.2.1
Add "If the original registration includes a mapping to ISO/IEC 10646," to beginning of this clause. RATIONALE: If a registration does not include a mapping to ISO/IEC 10646, its SA is not responsible for monitoring revisions to ISO/IEC 10646.

Accepted in principle. Wording will be changed to reflect the intention.

J-25. Clause 18.2.5
The wording of the first sentence is too complicated for an International Standard. Rewrite this sentence into easier expression without inversions such as "had it been submitted", and make it clearer the procedure to add mappings to the registration.

Accepted.

J-26. Clause 18.2.5
Change "according to clauses 13.5, 13.6 and 13.7," of the second sentence for "according to clauses 13.5, 13.6, 13.7 and 13.8". RATIONALE: The members of the subcommittee concerned with coded character sets can not send any comments without the circulation of the new application. Review procedure by the members of the subcommittee concerned with coded•character sets is described in clause 13.8.

Accepted in principle. This is handled in the revised clause 14.

J-27. Clause 18.2.5
Change "the revised mapping" of the second sentence for "the new or revised mapping".

Accepted.

J-28. Clause 19.3.2
Change "according to clause 13.7" for "according to clause 13.8".

Accepted.

J-29. Clause A.4.4
Divide the third dash into two dashes as follows:
-- no ISO/IEC 10646 character
-- (optionally) when no equivalent character is in ISO/IEC 10646, a character in either the private use area or private use planes of ISO/IEC 10646

Accepted.

J-30. Clause A.4.9
Change
> "by the character tabulation control character U+0009 of ISO/IEC 6429. (This control character is frequently called a horizontal tab character.)"

for
> "by the control character HT (CHARACTER TABULATION) of ISO/IEC 6429. (This control character was called HORIZONTAL TABULATION in the ancient version of ISO/IEC 6429.)".

RATIONALE: This clause specifies the format of machine-readable forms. Its specification is requested to be described in expressions that are more concrete even about character names. Remember that short identifiers (i.e., U+xxxx) are not defined for control characters specified by ISO/IEC 6429.

Accepted in principle.

J-31. Clause A.4.9
Add the encoding scheme into the guidelines of machine-readable forms. Japan strongly recommends that the code (not only repertoire) of machine-readable forms shall be ISO/IEC 646 IRV and its C0 control characters shall be limited to HT, CR and LF.

Rejected. The repertoire could be represented in 7 bits (ISO/IEC 646 IRV) or 8 bits (ISO/IEC 8859-1) or multiple octets (ISO/IEC 10646).

J-32. Clause A.4.11
Change "approved" for "accepted". RATIONALE: The RA shall not approve/disapprove a mapping. It's only the matter of the RA-JAC.

Accepted.

J-33. Clause A.4.13
Remove whole of this clause. RATIONALE: It is not necessary to specify such too detailed matter in this standard.

Rejected. This clause only informs the Sponsoring Authority that the Registration Authority may have additional requirements. The clause does not describe the requirements.

J-34. Clause A.4.13
Change the fifth dash for "whether the registration includes a mapping to ISO/IEC 10646 or not". RATIONALE: It is not clear whether this phrase requires YES/NO or a mapping to ISO/IEC 10646 itself in the indices.

Accepted in principle.

J-35. Clause A.7.1
Change "space" in the first sentence for "SPACE". RATIONALE: The small case "space" may mean SPACE, HT or".IDEOGRAPHIC SPACE. When considering machine-readable forms, it is better to limit to a character SPACE.

Accepted.

Comments accompanying Polish ballot on ISO/IEC CD 2375.2

The definition 4.6 of combining character has a large common part with the definition 4.7 of combining sequence. This suggests that, aiming at shorter and more clear definitions, the wording can be improved by avoiding the repetition.

Rejected. We agree that the wording could be improved (e.g. by splitting into several sentences, but the facts are correct. A new CD, just to approve a stylistic change to normative text, cannot be justified.

Comments accompanying Swedish ballot on ISO/IEC CD 2375.2

Main issue:
Although a few of the coding schemes at present in the International Register are for schemes not conformant to ISO/IEC 2022, the general terminology of the new ISO/IEC 2375 should be harmonized with that of other SC2 7/8-bit standards, in particular with the revisions of existing ISO/IEC 8859 parts and recent additions of new parts. Sweden therefore maintains the position stated in its comments on the original CD that, since the term "code table" is now defined in clause 4, the term "code position" should not be defined there, and that latter term not used in the text of the standard. Instead, the self-explanatory term "code table position" should be used in those places where the present draft uses "code position". It can be noted that this Swedish comment was declared "pending" in the proposed Disposition of Comments on the previous CD (SC2/WG3 N499), and it appears that none of the changes now introduced in the CD text influ-

ences this particular matter.

Rejected. We would have to provide a definition of "code table position". (It cannot be assumed to be "self-explanatory".)

Additional issues:
General: "International Register" should throughout have its initials capitalized.

Accepted. It occurs twice.

Subclause 4.6: For conformance with definitions in other standards, the word "graphical" on the third line should be removed. Also "6927" should be changed to "6937".

Accepted.

Subclause 4.7: "6927" should be changed to "6937".

Accepted.

Subclause 5.1: The word "general" on first line should be removed (since the description as defined later is a very detailed one).

Accepted.

Subclause 5.2: "The international register is located on ..." should be changed to e.g. "The international register is available through ..."

Accepted.

Subclause 8.2: The word "content" should be changed to "contents".

Rejected. The English is correct.

Subclause 11.3.2: The two first sentences could be seen as conflicting in specific cases. It appears that the first sentence could be removed without consequences to the purpose of the text.

Noted.

Subclause 12.1.1: The words "cover sheet" should be changed to "cover page". Also the second sentence should be changed to e.g. ".. to register the coding scheme(s) of an
approved ..."

Accepted. And: rejected; we should not introduce the word "scheme".

Subclause 12.1.2: Second sentence should be changed to "... shall include a document...."

Accepted.

Subclause 13.3: The three items referring to 12.1.1, 12.1.2 and 12.1.3 could be replaced by a single item referring to 12.1.

Rejected. The current wording is precise.

Subclause 17.1: The wording in parentheses should be changed to "... (and the Owner of Origin and/or Copyright Owner, as applicable) ..."

Accepted.

Subclause 18.1.2: Reference to 18.1 should be changed to 18.1.1. Also the meaning of "... international, governmental ..." is not clear. Is "... international and/or governmental ..." intended? (A Note exemplifying this condition might be helpful.)

Accepted.

Subclause 18.1.3: The situation described in this text is somewhat unclear. Is e.g. the case of the 8859-7 revision intended? (Where the original G1 set was identical to ISO-IR 126, and the G1 of the revised standard will be ISO-IR 227.)

Rejected.

Subclause 18.2.3: What if the Sponsoring Authority (which may in some cases no longer exist) does not submit a revised mapping at the time an (indisputable) error is discovered? Could the Registration Authority initiate a correction?

Does this comment have to do with this clause?

Subclause A.3.1.2: For last item of subclause see comment above on 18.1.3.

Noted.

Subclause A.4.5 could seem to contradict the first sentence in A.4.7.

Please be specific.

Subclause A.4.9: The word "to" on the first line should be removed. The word "any" should be added before "alternate" on the third line.

The editors are a bit lost. Please return to this in the DIS if necessary.

Subclause A.7.2: The meaning of the text is not quite clear, and the first example is misleading; ISO-IR 199 is used only as the G1 set of ISO/IEC 8859-14, not as the complete standard coding scheme.

The editors are a bit lost. Please return to this in the DIS if necessary.

Subclause B.2.2: The word "aesthetic" on the last line should be exchanged, e.g. to "typographic".

Accepted.

Clause D.5: The shading (and its explanatory text) should be removed.

Accepted.

Clause D.6: Ditto.

Ditto.